



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2021

From re-education to child protection: an analysis of cantonal policy norms in Switzerland 1970-2018

Reiss, Thomas

Abstract: Child placement policies have undergone considerable change in many Western European countries in the last decades. From taking away children without due process and abuse in foster homes and families to the inclusion of experts in decision-making and reducing informal arrangements, many countries made significant changes. The long-standing conservative-authoritarian norm that predominated child welfare policies has slowly but certainly been replaced by a norm that centers around child protection. State intervention in parental care is highly delicate as it interferes with one of the most private areas of private life: the education of children. In the federal system of Switzerland the 26 subnational units, the cantons, enjoy a large degree of autonomy in social policies, which results in great heterogeneity across cantons. As the subnational policy diversity in this field has so far not been analyzed for all cantons longitudinally, we collected the first comprehensive data set to do this. With this innovative data set we aim to answer the question what drives the adoption of child protection policy norms in Switzerland in the last 50 years. Subnational policymaking operates under a certain pressure to harmonize, while at the same time, leaving considerable room for maneuver for the cantons to adopt solutions that fit best for them. Due to the small size of many cantons, they coordinate and cooperate on a regular basis with each other in various policy fields. I thus argue that participation and frequency of Intergovernmental Meetings promotes the adoption of new policy norms. I furthermore argue that phases of politicization lead to policy norm adoption. The paper contributes twofold. First, it provides the first comprehensive analysis of a policy norm change for a social care policy that is crucial to gender roles in Western societies. Second, it applies policy norm diffusion to the subnational level and thereby advances the policy diffusion literature.

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-206810>

Conference or Workshop Item

Published Version

Originally published at:

Reiss, Thomas (2021). From re-education to child protection: an analysis of cantonal policy norms in Switzerland 1970-2018. In: ECPR General Conference, Virtual event 2021, 30 August 2021 - 3 September 2021, European Consortium for Political Research.

From Re-Education to Child Protection

An Analysis of Cantonal Policy Norms in Switzerland 1970 - 2018

Thomas Reiss [†] *

August 13, 2021

Prepared for Prepared for the ECPR Virtual General Conference 30.08.-03.09.2021

Work in progress - do not circulate without the author's permission

Abstract

Child placement policies have undergone considerable change in many Western European countries in the last decades. From taking away children without due process and abuse in foster homes and families to the inclusion of experts in decision-making and reducing informal arrangements, many countries made significant changes. The long-standing conservative-authoritarian norm that predominated child welfare policies has slowly but certainly been replaced by a norm that centers around child protection. State intervention in parental care is highly delicate as it interferes with one of the most private areas of private life: the education of children. In the federal system of Switzerland the 26 subnational units, the cantons, enjoy a large degree of autonomy in social policies, which results in great heterogeneity across cantons. As the subnational policy diversity in this field has so far not been analyzed for all cantons longitudinally, we collected the first comprehensive data set to do this. With this innovative data set we aim to answer the question what drives the adoption of child protection policy norms in Switzerland in the last 50 years. Subnational policymaking operates under a certain pressure to harmonize, while at the same time, leaving considerable room for maneuver for the cantons to adopt solutions that fit best for them. Due to the small size of many cantons, they coordinate and cooperate on a regular basis with each other in various policy fields. I thus argue that participation and frequency of Intergovernmental Meetings promotes the adoption of new policy norms. I furthermore argue that phases of politicization lead to policy norm adoption. The paper contributes twofold. First, it provides the first comprehensive analysis of a policy norm change for a social care policy that is crucial to gender

[†]PhD Candidate, Department for Political Science, University of Zurich; Email: reiss@ipz.uzh.ch

*Previous versions of this paper were presented at the Reconceptualizing Social Care Workshop at the Akademie für Politische Bildung in Tutzing and the Annual Conference of RC19, International Sociological Association 25-27 August 2021 at the University of Fribourg.

roles in Western societies. Second, it applies policy norm diffusion to the subnational level and thereby advances the policy diffusion literature.

Introduction

The history of child placements gained increasing attention all over Western Europe in the last decade as victim's organizations pushed for rehabilitation (Schnurr, 2017). Until the 1980s children, juveniles as well as adults were put in foster care or in jail for various reasons that are hardly comprehensible from today's perspective. Children often faced hard labor on farms or authoritarian and cruel foster home supervisors. Many of the children that were placed outside their family home suffered physical or psychological harm. With changing societal norms, pressure from victim groups and the ratification of the European Convention on Human Rights and the UN Children's Rights Convention Switzerland (as well as other Western European countries) reformed many of the most problematic aspects of its child placement policy regimes in order to guarantee a certain level of due process and fostering protective environments for children to grow up in.¹

The nature of child placement policies makes the policy area a highly delicate one as regulations interfere with one of the most private matters of parents: the right to parental care. Now, child placement policies emerged by the end of the 19th century in some cantons and the first nation-wide regulations went into force with the Civil Code of 1912. This was still a period of very low-key regulations which barely intervened into the parent's responsibility and lasted until the 1970s. At the same time society, and particularly care duties, were almost exclusively carried out by women in the private sphere. But then, particularly in the last 50 years, considerable change was undertaken, on the policy as well as the implementation level that radically shifted the norms and values under which children are raised in Swiss society. This does not restrain itself to the matter of child placements of course, but also gender relations, stereotypes and roles in general. With increasing participation of women in all areas of societal life, an expanding welfare state since the 1980s (including new societal groups Häusermann, 2010), the distribution of care duties and the perception thereof underwent considerable change. Hence, child placements used to operate under conservative norms and gender roles, but was slowly modernized. This development did not take place without friction: The change of social care duties has not gone uncontested. While child care duties used to be almost exclusively conducted by women (they still disproportionately are), the child protection services are increasingly professionalized, enabling various new settings

¹The push for political rehabilitation for the victims only started in the 2010s. With the pressure of the so-called 'reparation initiative' (*Wiedergutmachungsinitiative*) the Federal Council issued a formal excuse to the victims in 2013 (Bundesamt für Justiz, 2013). A counterproposal to the initiative by parliament that granted financial compensations for the victims went into force in 2017 (Bundeskanzlei, 2017). The Federal Council furthermore installed an independent expert commission in 2014 and the National Research Program 76 (NRP 76), titled 'Welfare and Coercion', was initiated (www.nfp76.ch). The research program focuses on different political, economic, historic, psychological, and sociological aspects of coercive measures in Switzerland. My project is situated in this program is being carried out in partnership with Ecoplan AG in Berne.

in which children can be raised. This ranges from highly specialized institutions for traumatized children to low-threshold social counseling services. The latest wave of reforms particularly aimed at professionalization of child protection services and has met political resistance from some right-wing politicians and the implementation phase of the reform was strongly mediatized (Hildbrand et al., 2020).

In my project we collected a comprehensive data set on all relevant regulations from 1970 to 2018. However, the focus of this paper is more fine-grained: It looks at the intent of the child placement policy regimes. Historically, cantons found different ways to incorporate the first child placement regulations. Some cantons regulated certain aspects in poor relief laws, others in the civil code, some in health policies. Over time the number of regulations increased and the regulations became more fine-grained. It, however, took a while to harmonize to what can be labeled today as a child protection paradigm. Hence, the main purpose of the legislation is to ensure the well-being of children when they are raised. The first regulations reflected the prevailing conservative moral conceptions, but with time many cantons incorporated better legal protections. Some were forced by developments on the national level, some added regulations without federal pressure. The research question then is: *How did this change in the intent of the child placement policy regimes between 1970 and 2018² come about and what factors contributed to it?*

I analyze this question by looking at how cantons regulated several aspects of child placements. In order to do this, I measure whether a) a canton recognizes a norm and b) commits to it in its legislation. In a second step I look at several factors that led to changes in the legislation. Here I particularly focus on interdependent policymaking that, as I argue, is inherent in a federal state as policymaking is driven by coordination, cooperation and the spread of norms. I thus employ diffusion theory by assuming that experiences made in one polity (e.g. supranational organizations, the federal level, other cantons or communes) are not independent from each other. For this purpose, I make two larger arguments: First, intercantonal cooperation serves as a platform for knowledge transfer. Second, I argue that two different phases of politicization have influenced cantonal policy regimes: First, the salience of the issue rose due to changing societal norms and a number of scandals at foster homes. This salience increase led to a number of changes in the policies on the cantonal and federal level. Second, new actors were able to increasingly influence the policy discourse, which subsequently led to a shift towards professionalization. Both pushed towards more focus on child protection.

The paper seeks to make two contributions: First, it provides the first comprehensive analysis of policy norm change for a contested social care policy that interferes with a highly delicate matter: parental rights. This is paramount for the understanding of

²1970 as the starting point was chosen to ensure the capturing of the legal situation before the considerably large changes in legislation in the 1970s.

changing gender roles and norms in Western societies. Second, it applies policy norm diffusion on the subnational level and links politicization to it and thus contributes to the policy diffusion literature. The paper will be structured as follows: The first part entails a short introduction to the policy field. It is followed by a theoretical part that also entails the hypotheses. In the final section I detail the data and the collection process, the operationalization and the methods that I plan to use.

Child Placement Policies in Switzerland

There are several reasons for which parental care is suspended or children are put into foster families or institutions. For the purpose of my project I am only considering procedures that are regulated in the civil law (hence, not in the criminal law for punitive reasons). Moreover, I exclude regulations and placements concerning health reasons and special needs education. My project stems from the concept of child placements, but for this paper I look specifically at the intent of the legislation. I orient myself on legislation that is focused on child placements as today's child protection regulations stem from them. Child placements refer to the procedure of withdrawing the right of the parents to decide the place of residence of their child.

Today these measures operate with the goal to ensure good protection of children, but the policy field originated from regulations for the poor (and others) and evolved heavily in the second half of the 20th century (Lengwiler et al., 2013). Until the Civil Code of 1907 formulated the first child placement measures on the national level, cantons were fully responsible. The level of federal regulations increased markedly in the last century, however. Several developments led to major changes in the cantonal policy regimes, but also on the federal level. The literature identifies largely two developments that caused changes in the legislation. First, in the light of public pressure due to a number of scandals related to violence and maltreatment in foster homes and the ratification of the European Convention on Human Rights in the 1970s, reforms aimed at improving the procedural standards of child placements and better legal protection (Zatti, 2005). The revision of the Civil Code in 1977 and its corresponding decree introduced the term child protection into the national legislation and furthermore introduced an authorization requirement for foster parents, defined foster relations, listed requirements for the withdrawal of parental responsibilities, regulated oversight and defined jurisdiction (Zatti, 2005). The second wave in the late 2000s took place in the light of increased influence of professionals in social work and a professionalization of the procedures. It led to a major reform on the federal level in 2008 that aimed at the professionalization of the field by including professionals in decision-making, installing technical decision-making bodies, more detailed rules of the procedure, and better legal protection (Schnurr, 2017). These reforms mandated the cantons to adopt minimum standards, cantonal heterogeneity persisted, however. While the cantons have largely not been bound to many standards, these developments have increased the number of regulations on the federal level and thus narrowed the room for maneuver for the cantons (Lengwiler et al., 2013).

As mentioned previously, for this paper I examine the intent of the policy regime. In order to understand what aspects are regulated in child policy regimes, I developed five dimensions that are depicted in Table 1. Each dimension is separated further in

elements: i) Due process, ii) professionalization, *iii) objectives*, iv) federalism and v) centralization.³ For this paper, I am only interested in the third column (red). The *objectives* reflects the intent of the policy and asks whether the policy targets the re-education of underprivileged groups or on child protection.

Table 1: Dimensions

Due Process	Professionalization	Objective	Federalism	Centralization
Authorization requirement	Technical authority	Intent of policy regime	Competences	Financing
Oversight	Number of decision-makers			
Appeal	Required qualifications			
	Catchment area			

³*Due process* refers to having an authorization requirement, oversight and the possibility to appeal. *Professionalization* means the extent to which decision-making is professionalized. The degree of federalism describes how the competences are distributed between the canton and its communes (i.e. *right to decide*). Lastly, *centralization* captures the different levels of government performance (*right to act*).

Theory & Hypotheses

As the previous section discusses, cantons are responsible to implement certain minimum standards that the federal level sets forth. Policymaking on the cantonal, the subnational level, takes place in the light of multiple influences. While there certainly are manifold canton-specific factors such as urbanity, socio-demographic setup or partisan composition of parliament and government, there are the aforementioned federal regulations that provide certain legally binding restrictions. Furthermore, as all cantons are located within the same nation-state, have similar organizational structures, the same legal federal framework, similar political systems and so on. As cantons differ widely in their size (Zurich has roughly 1.6m inhabitants, while Appenzell Innerrhoden has 16'000), there problem-solving capacities as well as their government activity vary drastically. Thus, there are a variety of policy fields where cantons cooperate with each other (Bochsler, 2009; Bochslers & Sciarini, 2006). This *horizontal cooperation* offers opportunities for cantons to coordinate and cooperate, oftentimes with neighboring cantons, to solve issues more efficiently together with others. There are two types of horizontal cooperation that are relevant for the case at hand: i) inter-governmental coordination bodies, called conferences, and ii) treaties between cantons for various policy areas, called concordats (Bochsler, 2009). There is “the main” conference of all cantonal governments, but there are also 16 sectoral conferences where the relevant minister for specific policy fields meet on a regular basis to exchange ideas and solve problems together (Bochsler, 2009: 352) (the guardianship conference was established in 1944 (Bochsler, 2010: 124)).

Hence, subnational policies operate under a tension between diversity on the one hand and uniformity on the other hand. While the federal level defines minimum standards, cantons are left with relative autonomy to find solutions that fit for them. Due to the small-scaled nature of cantonal policymaking, I argue that coordination plays a crucial role in the spread of ideas, norms and policy solutions. In this logic, I argue that it makes sense to employ diffusion theory to explain the spread of regulations and in our case: the intent of the policy regime. In a second step, I discuss the literature on politicization.⁴

Diffusion means the spread of new ideas, concepts, or practices across social systems (Rogers, 2003). Starting from the distinction between internal and external determinants (Berry & Berry, 1990), the recent literature focuses on the mechanisms of diffusion (Füglister, 2012; Gilardi, 2010; Gilardi & Wasserfallen, 2019; Maggetti & Gilardi, 2016; Shipan & Volden, 2008) and methodological contributions (Desmarais et al., 2015; Gi-

⁴Canton-specific factors are not thoroughly discussed in this paper, but are nevertheless considered for the analysis. These are the political landscape (partisan theory), the institutional (federalism and use of direct democratic rights), the socio-demographic (urbanization) setup and the resources of a canton.

lardi & Füglistner, 2008; Volden, 2006).⁵ Diffusion theory⁶ is well-applicable to the study of cantonal child placement policies for a number of reasons. The main underlying assumption holds that policymaking in one canton is not independent of the policymaking in other polities (e.g. Braun & Gilardi, 2006; Graham et al., 2013). Cantons maneuver in a multi-layer environment. Federal states characterize themselves by a coexistence of two different kinds of political systems: subnational units and the federal state (Panke, 2018: 1873-1874). Thus, the competences of the federal state, as well as the cantons, are designated in the constitution and there exists a division of labor between the cantons and the federal state. When designing a policy, cantons can look at experiences of other units (in the multi-layer framework), react to incentives, or act according to norms. Therefore, a high level of interdependency is plausible.

There is widespread consensus in the literature that there are different ways through which policies can diffuse. For this paper I am, however, only focusing on emulation.⁷

Emulation

Emulation refers to the spread of social norms (Gilardi, 2012; Holzinger & Knill, 2007: 94-95; Meseguer & Gilardi, 2009). Shipan & Volden (2008: 842-843) argue that emulation means that governments copy policies from other governments to appear in a more favorable light, hence it means norm diffusing (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998).⁸ In order for that to happen, knowledge about cantonal policies in a field have to be spread.

Emulation can work through different channels, thus how information spreads is crucial (Rogers, 2003). Policymakers have to gain information about other cantons' adoptions and their consequences for diffusion to work. Emulation can work through role models, groups of experts that advocate for a policy, or the emulation of self-identified peers (Simmons et al., 2006). A possible realm of communication are networks (Balla, 2001; Bearce & Bondanella, 2007; Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998; McNeal et al., 2003). Thus, through the communication in these networks, actors have the opportunity to gain knowledge about the success and normative views of others' policies.

A crucial flow of information in the federal structure of Switzerland are the aforementioned sectoral conferences as well as the meetings associated with concordats. These

⁵Cross-country applications: Gilardi (2012); Dobbin et al. (2007); Gilardi et al. (2009); Simmons & Elkins (2004); Greenhill (2010); Federal states: Shipan & Volden (2006); Kübler & Widmer (2007); Gilardi & Füglistner (2008); Wasserfallen (2014); Wasserfallen (2015); Strebel & Widmer (2012); Strebel (2011); Füglistner (2012); Trein (2017).

⁶Distinguished from *policy convergence* (Knill, 2005: 765-768), which analyzes how policies converge (policy convergence can, however, be the result of a diffusion process (Maggetti & Gilardi, 2016)) and *policy transfer* that focuses more on the individual processes.

⁷The other mechanisms are learning, competition and coercion (Gilardi & Wasserfallen, 2019; Shipan & Volden, 2008; Simmons et al., 2006). As the focus of this paper is the diffusion of a norm, child protection, this mechanism is most appropriate.

⁸Emulation is closely associated with isomorphism, the process of homogenization (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). The term describes how actors converge on shared norms over time.

conferences can be regarded as venues of knowledge transfer and can thus be an important facilitator for spreading information to other cantons.⁹ Emulation can thus be regarded as a side-product of cooperation in this context.

Contact Hypothesis

The Contact Hypothesis aims at investigating the flow of information described above and thus employs the approach of Füglistner (2012). It expects that an increasing number of contacts leads to an increased amount of information that is being passed and thus to more policy adoptions. This is not a targeted effort, but rather messy and unstructured.

H1a: A canton is more likely to adopt a child placement policy intent of a canton it has more frequent meetings in relevant sectoral conferences.

Emulation is furthermore more likely to take place with self-identified peers (Simmons et al., 2006). In this respect, Bochsler & Sciarini (2006) find that geographical proximity, language and denomination explain cooperation. It thus seems plausible that cantons emulate policies that they are similar with.

H1b: A canton is more likely to adopt a child placement policy intent of a canton it shares a border with.

H1c: A canton is more likely to adopt a child placement policy intent of a canton it shares the language with.

H1d: A canton is more likely to adopt the child placement policy intent of a canton it shares the denomination with.

Politicization

The literature on politicization revolves around the question of what drives the fate of policy issues. The bulk of the literature centers around the issue of EU integration (Green-Pedersen, 2012; Hooghe & Marks, 2009). It is argued that politicization can be explained with the existence of incentives that an issue can offer to parties. Thus, parties politicize an issue if it could be electorally successful and de-politicize an issue if it could harm the electoral prospects of a party. Conceptually, Schattschneider (1957) identifies three dimensions of politics on which Grande & Hutter (2016) rely as well: i) issue salience, ii) actor expansion, iii) actor polarization. Salience is the “most basic dimension for politicization” (Grande & Hutter, 2016: 8), thus a certain level of public debate around an issue is necessary in order for it to be politicized. As for actor expansion, Grande & Hutter (2016: 8-9) distinguish between an actor expansion within and across political arenas and between the electoral arena and the protest arena. Lastly, actors

⁹Strebel (2011) shows that sectoral and regional conferences can explain the spread of energy policies in the Swiss cantons, while Füglistner (2012) shows that for the health care sector. For the international level Greenhill (2010): 129-30 argues the same.

have to take differing positions in order for the issue to be politicized, that is how polarized an issue is (Grande & Hutter, 2016: 9-10).

The literature on politicization is focused heavily on nation-states and hardly on the subnational level. This is likely due to two reasons. First, political science generally focuses overwhelmingly on political contests on the national level. That is, subnational elections, party strategies and issue salience is rarely a matter of analysis. Second, politicization requires an audience (the public or the electorate) to be targeted. Thus, the media is an important transmitter, but is increasingly organized on the national level. It is therefore more difficult to witness a distinct political public in the individual cantons, as media coverage of the national political arena is dominant.

Politicization Hypotheses

I argue that there are mainly two developments that are attributed to the (de-)politicization of child placements that altered the political conflict around the issue between 1970 and 2018: a) public pressure and b) academization of social work. First, a rising number of scandals in foster homes paired with the anti-capitalist and anti-authoritarian *Heimkampagne* (1970-72), which demanded the abolishment of foster homes altogether, led to reforms in many cantons that aimed at improving legal protections and procedural aspects were improved (Germann, 2016; Schär, 2008). Thus, by bringing the issue of child placements into the public arena, the issue gained salience and in turn influenced policies. The second development can be attributed to institutionalization of university chairs in social work/pedagogy that led to the academization of social work, which in turn led to the professionalization of the field (Lengwiler et al., 2013). I thus argue that not public pressure alone, but the influence of emerging expert networks and discourses paired with the call for political rehabilitation of former victims politicized the issue again and influenced the political conflict (Lengwiler et al., 2013).

Hence, child placements were politicized in two different ways. First, by mounting public pressure, that increased the salience of the issue:

H3: When the issue of child placements is more politicized, a canton is more likely to change its child placement policy regime intent towards child protection.

Second, with the involvement of new actors in the political discourse. Cantons with closer ties to universities are more prone to receive that influence earlier (Professionalization Hypothesis).

H4: The closer a canton is to a university of applied sciences with a chair of social work, the more likely it adopts a child placement policy regime intent towards child protection.

Methods & Data

In this section I lay out the empirical framework. This includes the data collection process, the data itself, the planned operationalization as well as the planned analysis. As the data collection process has just finished at the beginning of August, I was not able to do any analysis at this point.

Data

As mentioned in the Introduction, the project is carried out in partnership with Ecoplan AG in Berne. For the data collection process, we distributed the duties geographically, so everyone had to travel the least. In this sense Ecoplan AG was responsible to collection data in the Western part of Switzerland and Ticino (GE, VD, VS, FR, NE, JU, AG, LU, TI, BE, SO, BL, BS), while the Department for Political Science of the University of Zurich in Zurich was responsible to collect the data from all cantons in Eastern and Central Switzerland (ZH, UR, OW, NW, ZG, SZ, GL, TG, SG, GR, AI, AR, SH).

We collected data on all relevant laws, decrees by the government, relevant concordats, and parliamentary documents attached to the relevant policies. The data collection process started in March 2020 and was suddenly halted by the restrictions due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Our initial approach foresaw that we would start with one canton each and gather experiences as to how to efficiently get to the data and get it into a machine-readable and quantified manner in order to analyze it. Due to the restrictions we changed the mode of work to working parallel on different cantons, which made it far more difficult.

For the time between 2010-2018 most of the documents are available online in almost all cantons. However, for the time before that, most cantons have the legal documents only in print in their archives. Hence, we traveled to all almost all cantonal archives in Switzerland in order to obtain the needed documents. For every relevant law or decree we tracked the changes in the relevant articles between 1970-2018 to assess its relevance for our purposes. Some cantons provide tables with all the changes (*Änderungstabellen*), some note them in foot notes, some have only (bi-)annual registers with the ordinances in force or the changes that occurred in the given time period. Cantonal heterogeneity also applies to administrative and archive organization.

The information that is contained in the ordinances was then transferred to an Excel sheet for each cantons which contains 75 variables for 1970-2018 on a yearly basis. That gives us a matrix of 75x48 for every canton. With this we can draw an accurate picture of how child placements were regulated in all cantons from 1970-2018 in a very fine-grained manner.

There is some data that I will still need to collect, namely canton-specific variables

(easily available through the statistical office), data on the meeting and agenda items of the sectoral conferences (available in archives) and data on media (should be available by late summer).

Analysis

Beginning in September I will start the analysis of the generated data. I will first give a descriptive overview of how the the intent of the policy regime developed over the investigated time period. In a second step, I will analyze the effect of several factors described above on the diffusion of the intent.

The literature has different ways of operationalizing a policy norm, in our case, the norm of child protection. For my analysis I plan to use the approach set forth by Tallberg et al. (2020) that uses two different measures to assess the extent of norm adoption. The first measure - *norm recognition* - describes the first mention of a the norm in it's legislation. That is in our case the first time the terms "Kindesschutz", "Kindeswohl", "Wohlbefinden des Kindes" is incorporated in a policy. The second measure - *norm commitment* - reflects whether a canton has committed to the principle of child protection and thus has dedicated the first comprehensive policy to the purpose. Furthermore, I am thinking about also incorporating the existence of some specific regulations that are widely seen as benefiting child protection into the analysis.

In order to measure politicization, I plan to analyze media data through the Swissdix database and search for a body of terms¹⁰ through 48 years of persistant media outlets such as *Der Tagesanzeiger*, *die Neue Zürcher Zeitung NZZ*, *Schweizerisches Radio und Fernsehen (SRF)*, *Der Bund*, *Basler Zeitung*, *Le Matin*, *Le Temps* etc. Additionally, I will calculate the geographical distance of every University of Applied Science with a chair for social work to each cantons capital.

The analysis of the diffusion mechanism through information flow and norm adoption through sectoral conferences will be done using the directed dyadic EHA approach (Volden, 2006), which has been widely used since (Baldwin et al., 2019; Gilardi et al., 2009; Gilardi & Füglistner, 2008; Shipan & Volden, 2014; Volden, 2016). The approach constructs every possible pair of units in both directions for every year. The variable is coded 1 if a canton adopts a policy regime that the other canton in the dyad has had *t-1*, otherwise 0 (Volden, 2006). As my dependent variable could be binary for every dyad-year (adoption: 0/1), a logit model would fit best as for any event-history data set (Beck et al., 1998). For robustness checks Gilardi et al. (2009) use ordered logit and a conditional Cox model.

¹⁰To be closer defined, but here's a start: "Kindesschutz", "KESB", "Vormundschaftsbehörde", "Kinderheim", "Jugendheim" (as well as their French equivalents)

References

- Baldwin, E., Carley, S. & Nicholson-Crotty, S. (2019). Why do countries emulate each others' policies? A global study of renewable energy policy diffusion. *World Development* 120(1): 29–45.
- Balla, S.J. (2001). Interstate Professional Associations and the Diffusion of Policy Innovations. *American Politics Research* 29(3): 221–245.
- Bearce, D.H. & Bondanella, S. (2007). Intergovernmental Organizations, Socialization, and Member-State Interest Convergence. *International Organization* 61(04).
- Beck, N., Katz, J.N. & Tucker, R. (1998). Taking Time Seriously: Time-Series-Cross-Section Analysis with a Binary Dependent Variable. *American Journal of Political Science* 42(4): 1260.
- Berry, F.S. & Berry, W.D. (1990). State Lottery Adoptions as Policy Innovations: An Event History Analysis. *American Political Science Review* 84(2): 395–415.
- Bochsler, D. (2009). Neighbours or Friends? When Swiss Cantonal Governments Co-operate with Each Other. *Regional & Federal Studies* 19(3): 349–370.
- Bochsler, D. (2010). Horizontale Zusammenarbeit als Lösung des Problems der Kleinräumigkeit im Schweizer Föderalismus? Eine quantitative Perspektive. In *Herausforderung HarmoS: Bildungspolitik, Föderalismus und Demokratie auf dem Prüfstein* (Vol. 1). Zürich: Schulthess.
- Bochsler, D. & Sciarini, P. (2006). Konkordate und Regierungskonferenzen. Standbeine des horizontalen Föderalismus. *LesGes* 17(1): 23–41.
- Braun, D. & Gilardi, F. (2006). Taking “Galton’s Problem” Seriously: Towards a Theory of Policy Diffusion. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 18(3): 298–322.
- Bundesamt für Justiz. (2013). *Bundesrat entschuldigt sich bei den Opfern von fürsorgerischen Zwangsmassnahmen*. Bern.
- Bundeskanzlei. (2017). *Eidgenössische Volksinitiative 'Wiedergutmachung für Verdingkinder und Opfer fürsorgerischer Zwangsmassnahmen (Wiedergutmachungsinitiative)'*. Bern: Bundesrat.
- Desmarais, B.A., Harden, J.J. & Boehmke, F.J. (2015). Persistent Policy Pathways: Inferring Diffusion Networks in the American States. *American Political Science Review* 109(2): 392–406.
- DiMaggio, P.J. & Powell, W.W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review* 48(2): 147–160.
- Dobbin, F., Simmons, B. & Garrett, G. (2007). The Global Diffusion of Public

- Policies: Social Construction, Coercion, Competition, or Learning? *Annual Review of Sociology* 33(1): 449–472.
- Finnemore, M. & Sikkink, K. (1998). International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization* 52(4): 887–917.
- Füglister, K. (2012). Where does learning take place? The role of intergovernmental cooperation in policy diffusion: Where does learning take place? *European Journal of Political Research* 51(3): 316–349.
- Germann, U. (2016). Entwicklungshilfe im Innern. Die Heimpolitik des Bundes im Zeichen sich wandelnder Staatlichkeit, 1960. In *Staatlichkeit in der Schweiz Regieren und verwalten vor der neoliberalen Wende*. Chronos Verlag.
- Gilardi, F. (2010). Who Learns from What in Policy Diffusion Processes?: Who learns from what? *American Journal of Political Science* 54(3): 650–666.
- Gilardi, F. (2012). Transnational Diffusion: Norms, Ideas, and Policies. In W. Carlsnaes (ed.), *Handbook of International Relations*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Gilardi, F. & Füglister, K. (2008). Empirical Modeling of Policy Diffusion in Federal States: The Dyadic Approach. *Swiss Political Science Review* 14(3): 413–450.
- Gilardi, F., Füglister, K. & Luyet, S. (2009). Learning From Others: The Diffusion of Hospital Financing Reforms in OECD Countries. *Comparative Political Studies* 42(4): 549–573.
- Gilardi, F. & Wasserfallen, F. (2019). The politics of policy diffusion. *European Journal of Political Research* 58(4): 1245–1256.
- Graham, E.R., Shipan, C.R. & Volden, C. (2013). The Diffusion of Policy Diffusion Research in Political Science. *British Journal of Political Science* 43(3): 673–701.
- Grande, E. & Hutter, S. (2016). Introduction: European integration and the challenge of politicisation. In S. Hutter, E. Grande & H. Kriesi (eds.), *Politicising Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenhill, B. (2010). The Company You Keep: International Socialization and the Diffusion of Human Rights Norms. *International Studies Quarterly* 54(1): 127–145.
- Green-Pedersen, C. (2012). A Giant Fast Asleep? Party Incentives and the Politicisation of European Integration. *Political Studies* 60(1): 115–130.
- Häusermann, S. (2010). 8 Reform Opportunities in a Bismarckian Latecomer: Restructuring the Swiss Welfare State. In B. Palier (ed.), *A Long Goodbye to Bismarck?: The Politics of Welfare Reform in Continental Europe*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

- Hildbrand, L., Stauffer, B., Sager, F. & Kuenzler, J. (2020). Erzählungen des Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutzes: Eine Anwendung und Erweiterung des *Narrative Policy Frameworks*. *Swiss Political Science Review* spsr.12401.
- Holzinger, K. & Knill, C. (2007). Ursachen und Bedingungen internationaler Politikkonvergenz. In K. Holzinger, H. Jörgens & C. Knill (eds.), *Transfer, Diffusion und Konvergenz von Politiken* (1. Aufl.). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Hooghe, L. & Marks, G. (2009). A Postfunctionalist Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus. *British Journal of Political Science* 39(1): 1–23.
- Knill, C. (2005). Introduction: Cross-national policy convergence: Concepts, approaches and explanatory factors. *Journal of European Public Policy* 12(5): 764–774.
- Kübler, D. & Widmer, T. (2007). Subnationale Unterstützung eines nationalen Drogenprogramms. Eine Panelanalyse mit Ereignisdaten in den Schweizer Kantonen. In K. Holzinger, H. Joergens & C. Knill (eds.), *Transfer, Diffusion und Konvergenz von Politiken* (1. Aufl.). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Lengwiler, M., Hauss, G., Gabriel, T., Praz, A.-F. & Germann, U. (2013). *Bestandsaufnahme der bestehenden Forschungsprojekte in Sachen Verding- und Heimkinder*. Bern: Bundesamt für Justiz.
- Maggetti, M. & Gilardi, F. (2016). Problems (and solutions) in the measurement of policy diffusion mechanisms. *Journal of Public Policy* 36(1): 87–107.
- McNeal, R.S., Tolbert, C.J., Mossberger, K. & Dotterweich, L.J. (2003). Innovating in Digital Government in the American States *. *Social Science Quarterly* 84(1): 52–70.
- Meseguer, C. & Gilardi, F. (2009). What is new in the study of policy diffusion? *Review of International Political Economy* 16(3): 527–543.
- Panke, D. (2018). Mehrebenenpolitik, Multi Level Governance. In R. Voigt (ed.), *Handbuch Staat*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.
- Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th edition.). New York: Free Press.
- Schattschneider, E.E. (1957). Intensity, Visibility, Direction and Scope. *American Political Science Review* 51(4): 933–942.
- Schär, R. (2008). Die Winden sind ein Graus, macht Kollektive draus!. Die Kampagne gegen Erziehungsheime. In *Zürich 68 kollektive Aufbrüche ins Ungewisse*. Baden: hier + jetzt.
- Schnurr, S. (2017). Child removal proceedings in Switzerland. In K. Burns, T.

- Pösö & M. Skivenes (eds.), *Child welfare removals by the state: A cross-country analysis of decision-making systems*. Oxford University Press.
- Shipan, C.R. & Volden, C. (2006). Bottom-Up Federalism: The Diffusion of Antismoking Policies from U.S. Cities to States. *American Journal of Political Science* 50(4): 825–843.
- Shipan, C.R. & Volden, C. (2008). The Mechanisms of Policy Diffusion. *American Journal of Political Science* 52(4): 840–857.
- Shipan, C.R. & Volden, C. (2014). When the smoke clears: Expertise, learning and policy diffusion. *Journal of Public Policy* 34(3): 357–387.
- Simmons, B.A., Dobbin, F. & Garrett, G. (2006). Introduction: The International Diffusion of Liberalism. *International Organization* 60(04): 781–810.
- Simmons, B.A. & Elkins, Z. (2004). The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy. *American Political Science Review* 98(1): 171–189.
- Strebel, F. (2011). Inter-governmental institutions as promoters of energy policy diffusion in a federal setting. *Energy Policy* 39(1): 467–476.
- Strebel, F. & Widmer, T. (2012). Visibility and facticity in policy diffusion: Going beyond the prevailing binarity. *Policy Sciences* 45(4): 385–398.
- Tallberg, J., Lundgren, M., Sommerer, T. & Squatrito, T. (2020). Why International Organizations Commit to Liberal Norms. *International Studies Quarterly* 64(3): 626–640.
- Trein, P. (2017). Europeanisation beyond the European Union: Tobacco advertisement restrictions in Swiss cantons. *Journal of Public Policy* 37(2): 113–142.
- Volden, C. (2006). States as Policy Laboratories: Emulating Success in the Children’s Health Insurance Program. *American Journal of Political Science* 50(2): 294–312.
- Volden, C. (2016). Failures: Diffusion, Learning, and Policy Abandonment. *State politics and policy quarterly* 16(1): 44–77.
- Wasserfallen, F. (2014). Contextual variation in interdependent policy making: The case of tax competition: Contextual variation in interdependent policy making: The case of tax competition. *European Journal of Political Research* 53(4): 822–839.
- Wasserfallen, F. (2015). The Cooperative Capacity of Swiss Federalism. *Swiss Political Science Review* 21(4): 538–555.
- Zatti, K.B. (2005). *Das Pflegekinderwesen in der Schweiz - Analyse, Qualitätsentwicklung und Professionalisierung*. Bundesamt für Justiz.